



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/602,990	06/24/2003	Thomas J. Perkowski	100-059USA000	9745
84704	7590	03/09/2009	EXAMINER	
Thomas J. Perkowski , Esq., P. C.			CARLSON, JEFFREY D	
Soundview Plaza			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
1266 East Main Street			3622	
Stamford, CT 06902				
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			03/09/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/602,990	PERKOWSKI ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Jeffrey D. Carlson	3622	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13 February 2009.

2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 63-107 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 63-107 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some * c) None of:

1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 2/13/09.

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application

6) Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to the papers filed 2/13/2009.

Double Patenting

1. Applicant has created quite a tangled web of similarly-focused pending applications, many of which are being examiner by this examiner. There appears to be no apparent rhyme or reason why so many applications are copending, nor any focus on any particular inventive twist or direction specific to each case, thus failing to create a clear line of demarcation between the applications. See MPEP § 822. For this reason, there are an overwhelming amount of overlapping claims and concepts which are subject to the following double patenting issues.

2. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the “right to exclude” granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

3. Claims 63-107 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over the following claims of the following copending applications.

<u>Application</u>	<u>Claims</u>
11/804769	1-19
10/876261	154-170
10/812341	31-57
10/059078	49-58
09/716848	497-507
10/693856	63-88
11/823828	8-21, 37-53
10/059076	78-99
10/058970	98-115
09/695744	478-489
10/059076	78-99
10/058970	98-115
09/695744	478-489

4. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other for the following reasons:

- It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill at the time of the invention to have provided such a system whether it is for offered products identified by product name, description, trademark or for offered services identified by service names, descriptions and service marks.
- It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill at the time of the invention to have characterized a BIN network with UPN/TM and URLs in a similar fashion as a collection of CPI links (URLs) in association with UPN/TM.

- A catalog of MMVK tags is taken to be equivalent to a library of MMVK tags and it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill at the time of the invention to have employed a collection of tags so that the system can properly link to a URL (by a well known HTML tag) so that the consumer can request and receive product information for a particular product.
- It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill at the time of the invention to have programmed the display modes of the MMVKs so that they deliver "information resources" as relevant to the consumer-requested product or service.

5. This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

6. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

7. Claims 63-107 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

- Claims 63-107 are taken to be system (apparatus) claims, yet they include many features which are presented as method steps rather than capabilities, rendering the claim scope uncertain. In these computer-based system

claims, the best way to set forth apparatus structure is to claim *capabilities* of the apparatus by stating an element/module/subsystem is *programmed to* *<perform an act>* OR is *configured to* *<perform an act>*, rather than claiming an element or an entity actively performs the act. A claim covering both an apparatus and a method of using that apparatus is invalid because such a claim “is not sufficiently precise to provide competitors with an accurate determination of the ‘metes and bounds’ of protection involved” and is “ambiguous.” MPEP 2173.05(p)(ii).

- Claims 63, 78, 93 – products which are offered for purchase; products that are offered for purchases; said advertising mode, first internet-enabled information server generates and serves; browser displays a GUI; browser...processes said MMVK tag; first internet-enabled information server automatically executes the...component...and generates and serves the corresponding MMVK; one or more of said...display mode[s] are automatically displayed.
- Claim 81 – team member uses said...subsystem to select said display modes.
- Claims 72, 87, 102 – a supply-chain information management system imports said UPN...TM...PD...into a database.
- Claims 74, 89, it is not clear whether applicant is attempting to actually claim the user’s web browser as part of the apparatus claim – and if so,

what browser capability is being claimed? If not, it is unclear in what way the apparatus/system is being further limited.

- Claim 104 – encountering...comprising the consumer clicking.
- Claims 75, 90, 105 – products are registered. Is this a step of registering? Applicant should limit the system/apparatus as including programmed functionality that is capable of registering products.

Allowable Subject Matter

8. As best understood, claims 63-107 appear to be allowable if rewritten or amended to overcome the rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. 112, 2nd paragraph, set forth in this Office action.

Conclusion

9. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jeffrey D. Carlson whose telephone number is 571-272-6716. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Fridays; off alternate Fridays.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Eric Stamber can be reached on (571)272-6724. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Jeffrey D. Carlson/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3622

Jeffrey D. Carlson
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 3622

jdc